

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

---

VOL. II.

DECEMBER, 1922.

No. 12.

---

## The True Criterion of Orthodoxy.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER, St. Louis, Mo.

Among the numerous questions that have come to the front in connection with the controversy between Fundamentalists and Liberalists, the one pertaining to the true criterion of orthodoxy is no doubt foremost in importance. In the general confusion which has followed in the wake of the discussion, men have repeatedly asked: What determines orthodoxy? Is orthodoxy a creedal shibboleth or merely a spiritual principle? That so simple a query has been raised in sober earnest, indeed, that it has been made a *status controversiae* in a controversy that engages the minds of learned theologians, is certainly a *testimonium paupertatis* to the present-day Christian Church. It shows the extent of the decay which rationalism has caused in the Church, and proves that the canker of infidelity, having already blighted the whole body of Christian doctrine, is about to destroy the very core of the Christian faith. No truly Christian theologian would seriously put that question and make it the subject of dubious inquiry. To every believing theologian the issue is clear from the start. He knows what orthodoxy means and entertains no doubts in regard to its criterion. To him there is only one test of orthodoxy — the Word of God. Only that is orthodox which is Biblical. *Quod non est Biblicum non est theologicum.* It is only since Modernism has discarded the fundamentals of Christian belief and annulled every article of the faith which was formerly regarded as an impregnable fortress that men must again ask what orthodoxy is and by what standard it should be gauged.

Of course, the reply of Modernists is negative. According to the liberalistic views of modern theologians, orthodoxy has nothing to do with dogma, tenet, or creed. Orthodoxy is therefore no creedal shibboleth. It is not determined by any confession or

standard of faith. If orthodoxy is anything, it is only a spiritual principle, a dynamic force which impels man to a life in accord with that of Christ. In the *Watchman-Examiner* (May, 1922) the following definition of what orthodoxy might mean to the theologian of our time was suggested in reply to the question, Who is orthodox? The following answer was given: "He is orthodox whose views of God, of Jesus Christ, of man and their mutual relations, are such as lead him to love as God loves, to live as Christ lived, and to be a brother to his fellow-men. The only true and adequate test of the correctness of man's religious views is their result in his life. Absolutely, there is no Baptist dogmatic by which a man's beliefs may be judged. The basis of our fellowship is *participation in the common life in Christ, not a form of doctrine*; and from the point of view of our constitution as churches, *the only heretic is one who ventures to propound a dogmatic and to test men by it.*"

This statement is sufficiently clear to show what the writer's conception of orthodoxy — and orthodoxy here stands for Christianity — is. According to his conception, every one is orthodox, that is, Christian, whose religious views lead him to love and help his fellow-men and to lead a decent life. Certainly a most paganistic view of orthodoxy! It is true, the writer employs the name of God and of Christ. However, he fails to state whether the God he has in mind is the Triune God; and it is clear that he does not care to have any definite Christian dogma or teaching connected with the person and work of Christ. "The basis of our fellowship is *participation in the common life in Christ, not a form of doctrine*," he states emphatically. What this "common life in Christ" is, how it is brought about and preserved, the writer does not say. One thing, however, is apparent: in the common life in Christ no *form of doctrine* must determine Christian fellowship. As soon as a person desires to propound a creed and to test men by it, he becomes a heretic and as such must be excommunicated. This shaft of impudent scorn and arrogant challenge, which is obviously directed against the Fundamentalists, who even now endeavor to propound a "dogmatic," shows the wide latitudinarian range of the author's proposed orthodoxy. It ultimately embraces all men, no matter what their beliefs may be. They may be Jews or Gentiles, Mohammedans or Parsees, Confucianists or Buddhists, so long as their views of God, of Jesus Christ, of man and their mutual relations, lead them to love as God loves, to live as Christ lived, and



to be brethren to their fellow-men, they are orthodox, that is, Christians. The writer would find no fault with any one's Christianity on doctrinal grounds. The only trouble arises when some one demands a creed, embracing, for example, the propositions that no other than the Triune God should be worshiped; that Christ should be acknowledged as the divine Son of God and true man, born of the Virgin Mary, the only Savior of man; and that the Bible should be accepted as the authoritative Word of God. In the ranks of fellowshippers to which the writer belongs, such a request would at once create unspeakable commotion. There would be serious trouble. The unlucky Fundamentalist who voices the demand would at once be excommunicated as a heretic, for "he is the only heretic who ventures to propound a dogmatic and to test men by it."

As if the statement were not clear enough to set forth the writer's warped views of Christianity, the following elucidations are appended for the benefit of those who may not have understood his argument. We read: "For instance, if a man finds that some doctrine of the Bible other than the theory of infallible verbal inspiration of its writings makes the book of greater utility and power in his life, more certainly brings him into touch with the power of God, and better enables him to love as God loves or live as Christ lived: *if this doctrine of his better ministers to his need to attain Christly character, then his view is right, allowable, and justified, and to stigmatize him as a heretic is a blind folly on the part of the Church.*" Let the reader contemplate what this sentence means. In unmistakable words the writer claims that if any one should see fit to deny the inspiration of the Bible because he finds that this denial better ministers [to his need] to attain Christly character, then his view is right and justified, and to stigmatize him as a heretic is a blind folly on the part of the Church.

But to proceed. The writer goes on: "Or again, if the theory of evolution conceived as the method by which God brought the universe and its variety of beings into existence is one that to his mind and heart more surely glorifies God than a theory of a *fiat-creation*; if the evolutionary process seems the more normal and rational conception of the present activity of God, and such a conception best enables him to give himself to the influence and power of divine spirit, *then every law of psychology and every principle of Christ is violated* by forbidding such a doctrine or by refusing fellowship to him who holds the view." In this paragraph the writer expresses himself even more forcibly. To stigmatize one

who denies the inspiration of the Bible as a heretic is, in his mind, blind folly on the part of the Church. However, to question or deny the orthodoxy of one who rejects the Biblical report of creation and believes in evolution means, according to the writer, *to violate every law of psychology and every principle of Christ.*

If the Christian reader has thus far failed to gasp at these impudent challenges, he will surely do so when he reads the following: "Once more, if one sincerely finds the current conception of God as One who needs propitiation before He can or will forgive and save men; if he finds this doctrine repugnant to his own idea of a moral God and discredited by the revelation of God in Jesus Christ; and if he holds to Paul's doctrine of the grace of God in Jesus Christ, believing that Jesus came to save men from sin rather than to save them from God; and if this doctrine most and best aids him in loving God, in forgiving as God forgives, and in living like Christ, *then he is orthodox in the only worthy sense, and it is the infatuation of dogmatism to stamp him with theological odium.*"

It was this paragraph mainly which induced us to reply to this most brazen piece of effrontery. Of course, anybody is free to reject the Bible, to adopt the views of evolutionary science, and to deny the vicarious satisfaction of Christ. However, heretofore such men as saw fit to differ from Christian theology were honest enough to confess that they refused to be styled Christians. Men like Voltaire, Ingersoll, Diderot, and Tom Paine very emphatically refused to be called Christian because the Christian faith was repugnant to them. However, here it is claimed and insisted upon that every deist, agnostic, atheist, and naturalist is entitled to the privilege of calling his specific religious views orthodox and Christian, and that to stigmatize them as heretical is a violation of every "law of psychology and every principle of Christ."

If the above had appeared in a monistic, Unitarian, or Masonic periodical, it would not have surprised any one. However, it has come to us, as it has come to many thousands of Christian readers, through the columns of a periodical which is outspoken in its defense of the fundamentals of the Christian faith. This shows the confusion which prevails in many of the sectarian churches, especially in the Baptist. There two factors, one liberal and the other conservative, labor side by side in the same pulpits, the same schools, and the same editorial offices, and both demand a hearing, each party setting forth its claim and denouncing the other. Nevertheless, the external union of the church-body must be preserved.



By no means will either party come out and be separate. So we may view the above statement as a sort of compromise. Fundamentalists and Liberalists cannot agree as to doctrine. Even the weakest doctrinal platform is offensive to the Modernist faction; hence the compromise to preserve a union not on the basis of *one common faith*, but upon that of a *common life in Christ*! In other words, if those who bear the name Baptist agree to observe a certain standard in their lives in accord with the general ideals of Christianity, they are to be received as brethren, and fellowship is to be extended to them, no matter what their belief may be.

Fundamentalists, we are sure, do not agree to this new criterion of orthodoxy. It is thrust upon them by an overwhelming majority. However, in the end they will no doubt accept it; for, as they have shown, they are not willing "to come out from among them and be separate." They are as unionistic as the liberalistic party that opposes them. They insist upon the preservation of the union of the church-body as much as do the Rationalists. Their slogan, too, is: Let doctrinal differences by no means disrupt the Church and impede our social and missionary enterprises! We must do big things; above all, we must collect large sums to support our world program. This can never be done if we separate. Thus for the sake of secondary considerations they will, no doubt, swallow the nauseating pill and preserve the peace. However, this rotten, horrible peace is purchased at a tremendous price.

If the above criterion of orthodoxy is accepted, it means that they will give up every teaching of the Bible and thus ultimately cease to be a Christian Church. The Bible clearly proclaims itself a standard of truth. Whatever agrees with its teaching is orthodox; whatever disagrees with it is heterodox. Scripture is more than a mere code of morals. It is, first of all, a "dogmatic," a book of definite doctrines given by God to make man wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. As such, the Bible claims to be the absolute canon of truth, the only and absolute criterion of orthodoxy and heterodoxy. No other inference can be drawn from the words of the Savior in which He announces Himself as the Way, the Truth, and the Life. John 14, 6. If Christ (and not the Christ as He lived, but as He taught) is the Way and leads to the Father, then everything that is opposed to His teachings is a path that leads astray. If He is the Truth, then whatever is taught in opposition to His Word is falsehood. If He is the Life, then every tenet not in accord with His doctrines means endless death.

No other inference is admissible. Only he, says Christ, is of the truth who hears My voice. John 18, 37. Even so, the whole Bible is the Word of God, 2 Tim. 3, 16, for the prophets spoke by the Spirit of Christ which was in them, Heb. 2, 11. So Paul regarded not only the message which he preached, but the whole Bible, as the canon of inspired truth. Very earnestly he warns his readers against all who "walk not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel." Gal. 2, 14; 2 Cor. 11, 2 ff. And he urges his readers, above all, to "mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them." Rom. 16, 17. According to Paul every one who teaches contrary to the Word of God "teaches otherwise" (*ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖ*), "knows nothing" (*μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος*), and "is destitute of the truth." 1 Tim. 6, 3. 4. Thus the issue is clear. Orthodoxy, according to Christ and the apostles, is absolute and unqualified adherence to the standards of Scriptural truth. Whatever doctrines are opposed to the teachings of Scripture are false doctrines, taught by false prophets, of whom the disciples of Christ are to beware. Matt. 7, 15. Any church, therefore, that fails to accept this standard of truth is a heterodox, unchristian, and antichristian church.

Again, if the above criterion of orthodoxy is accepted, the Baptist Church must needs become unchristian also in life. If the Bible is the Word of Truth which alone can save men's souls, Rom. 1, 16, if it is the power of God by which the Holy Ghost regenerates and sanctifies men, then any one who rejects this Word of God remains dead in sin and under the curse and condemnation of divine Law. Let those who glibly speak of loving as God loves, of living as Christ lived, and of leading a common life in Christ, remember that Christian love towards God, the Christian life in Christ, and true, Christian benevolence towards the brethren flow only from faith. Christ made this clear when He said: "I am the Vine; ye are the branches. He that abideth in Me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without Me ye can do nothing." John 15, 5. Here Christ avers that without faith in Him man cannot love as God loves, live as Christ lived, and love the brethren. No one can come in touch with the power of God, attain Christly character, give himself to the influence and power of the divine Spirit, in fact, can do nothing, without faith in Christ. The common life in Christ demands, first of all, faith in Christ; and faith in Christ means to believe His Word. So Christ says in John 8, 31: "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples



indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Accordingly, the writer's prattle concerning a common life in Christ, without accepting the Word of Christ in its truth and purity, is nothing but a decoy to mislead the simple. "He that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16, 16. If any one refuses to accept the Word of God and to believe in Christ, even his best works of love, his charity and benevolence, are but *splendida vitia* before God. Hence, no church which rejects the Word of God can expect to be fruitful in good works, but comes under the condemnation of which Paul speaks in Rom. 1, 21. A church so utterly rebellious and unfaithful as the writer of the quoted paragraphs would have it to be stands condemned and rejected. "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." Rom. 1, 21—23.

Accepting the proposed criterion of orthodoxy, what kind of orthodoxy will be left to the Church? Religion has for its prime objective the salvation of men. It is true, the social gospel of the present-day Liberalists refuses to have anything to do with an eternal salvation. The social theology of our day is of this earth only, and seeks only the interests of this life. Nevertheless, as long as the hope of immortality remains in the hearts of men, so long will men desire salvation also beyond this life. Now, then, how must this salvation be secured? The modern theology rejects Christ's atonement and the fundamental doctrine of the Gospel concerning salvation through faith in Christ. Having rejected this blessed Way to life, how shall man secure salvation? There remains but one alternative — man must earn his salvation by loving as God loves, by living as Christ lived, by being a friend to his fellow-men. That is the "orthodox" plan of salvation of the present-day rationalistic church. However, this is a paganistic orthodoxy. Of this orthodoxy Paul says: "For as many as are of the works of the Law are under the curse." Gal. 3, 10. It is a damnable orthodoxy.

If that is true, then the outlook for the modern "Christian" orthodox church, of the kind which rationalistic theologians advocate, is dreary indeed. The future "Christian" church will have no Savior to take away man's sin, to regenerate, to redeem, and save. It cannot satisfy the yearnings of the soul; it is bare, dreadful,

comfortless. It has no consolation for the tribulation of this life, and no assuring message for the hour when the sinner must stand before God. It teaches sinners to reject God's Word and leaves them rejected of God. Hos. 4, 6. It can only urge the despairing sinner to do the impossible: to appease God's wrath by works which provoke wrath. Verily, the new criterion of orthodoxy is a most miserable surrogate for that which is offered to man in the Word of God. Let the churches accept it — and be damned.

The writer of the proposed test of orthodoxy has sought to ingratiate his criterion by a most clever sophism. By putting the question as he did: Is orthodoxy a credal shibboleth or a spiritual principle? he has succeeded in concealing and eliminating the true criterion of orthodoxy. Creeds are not popular in our time. Even churches dislike creeds. Moreover, creeds are made by men, and whatever is of men may be rejected by men. Thus from the start, as the reader scrutinizes the question, he will be inclined to favor the writer's view-point. If anything else can be offered as a criterion of orthodoxy than an offensive, unpopular creed, all the better! No doubt the majority of those who voted down the Fundamentalists at Indianapolis did so because of their opposition to binding creeds. Now, it is true, creeds are of relative value only. Any Christian may reject a creed, and must, under certain conditions, reject a creed. If a creed stands for something which man teaches in opposition to God's Word, it cannot demand recognition or acceptance. Thus the creeds of modern Liberalists — and they have creeds, very definite and clearly expressed creeds — must be rejected because they represent the carnal, devilish wisdom of unbelieving men. However, it is a different matter when a creed is a clear, reliable, and precise statement of Scriptural truth. In that case the creed is indeed a criterion of orthodoxy. Any one who accepts such a *regula fidei* is orthodox, and any one who rejects it is heterodox. The old definition of orthodoxy as made by Isidore Hispaliensis obtains to this day: "*Orthodoxus est recte credens.*" And *recte credens* means to acknowledge the norm of Scripture. Scripture must ever remain the source and norm of every creed, the true criterion of orthodoxy. This true standard of orthodoxy was restored to the Church by Luther, who assigned to the Holy Scriptures their rightful place as the only standard by which all doctrines are to be adjudicated. Very emphatically the Formula of Concord says: "*Credimus, confitemur et docemus unicam regulam et normam, secundum quam omnia dogmata omnesque*



*doctores aestimari et iudicari oporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse quam prophetica et apostolica scripta cum Veteris tum Novi Testamenti.*" (*Conc. Trigl.*, 777.) If Lutheran theologians subscribe to the Confessions of their Church not only *quatenus*, but also *quia*, it is because they are firmly convinced that the doctrines set forth in their standards of faith are the clear, precise, and infallible teachings of the Holy Scriptures. Hence they prize their Confessions and demand that all teachings conform to their Confessions; although the Word of God remains the only source and norm of faith, the *norma normans*.

True and Christian creeds, conforming in every respect to the teachings of the Holy Scriptures, are indeed necessary. Let the Fundamentalists bear this in mind. As surely as each individual Christian should give an account of the faith that is in him, so each church must give an account of its faith by means of confessions; and each church, in order that it may profess the Christian faith, must demand of its constituents adherence to its confession of faith. If the Indianapolis convention declared that Scripture alone should serve all Baptists as a creed, it was in the right theoretically only, not practically. The Holy Scriptures are indeed the only norm of orthodoxy; hence, if all Baptists would receive the teachings of Scripture as they stand and are written in unmistakable terms, then, indeed, every Baptist would be orthodox. However, this is not the case. The Liberalists reject even the fundamental teachings of Scripture. Even while employing Scriptural terms, they teach the very opposite of what Christ teaches. Thus the terms regeneration, faith, conversion, salvation, atonement, etc., are used in a meaning absolutely different from that employed by orthodox theology. And as long as this is the case, the Fundamentalists must insist upon the adoption of a creed which expresses in clear terms the doctrines of the Bible. If they cannot enforce this, there remains but one alternative, *viz.*, to come out from among the ungodly, liberalistic congregation of scoffers and be separate. — We have a few more things that we would like to say in this connection, and inculcate upon the Fundamentalists; however, let this suffice.

It is clear why the Liberalistic element in Indianapolis opposed the adoption of the Fundamentalists' creed. Rationalistic theology has discarded the Holy Scriptures and refuses to recognize their authority and demands. It has cast overboard every vital, essential doctrine of the Christian faith. Hence it is clear why

its adherents demand as a criterion of a man's orthodoxy only a righteous life. Having rejected the Christian truth, nothing remains for the advocates of modernism but to teach the paganistic, naturalistic way of salvation by work-righteousness. Accordingly, to them only he is orthodox who pursues this way and endeavors to merit heaven by holy living. For this reason they no longer can claim the name Christian. Their theology is antagonistic to Christ and ruinous to souls redeemed by Christ. Their theology is of the devil.

---

## A Bit of Recent Swedish Church History.

PROF. W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

### 26. THE RESOLUTION OF CONFIDENCE.

If the representatives who were believers in the Bible had thus drawn the shorter straw at the preparatory meeting in point of prudent tactics, they made good their disadvantage in this respect at the convention which began the day after. According to the list of subjects to be laid before the convention, the Kolmodin issue was not to be taken up until a resolution had been passed for the discharge of the present officers and until the election of directors and revisers had taken place. The professor had placed his membership in the directorate at the disposal of the convention in such a manner that he made his remaining in office dependent upon a vote of confidence which the convention was to pass endorsing his "*grundstaandpunkt*" (fundamental position) on the Bible. If they were unwilling to do this, he intended to resign. The majority of the directors on their part were in favor of such a vote of confidence. "Naturally one does not like to raise the question whether the directors of *Fosterlands-Stiftelsen* were acting in ignorance. However, if they were conscious of what was embraced in a vote of confidence for Professor Kolmodin's standpoint on the issue of the Bible, then, assuredly, the verdict which Protestant church history will render on these directors will always be severe. Kolmodin set up science as judge over the teachings of the Bible, while the foremost and basic principle of the Reformation emphasized the truth that the Bible alone is judge over all doctrines. In reality, then, the directors favored the idea that the convention surrender the first of the basic principles of the Reformation."

As we shall see, the majority at the convention, in blind confidence, followed the human counsel of the directors; but thanks



to the watchfulness of the believers in the Bible and the Confessions, matters took an entirely different course, and a decidedly greater difficulty was encountered than the majority in the directorate had expected. Above all, two things were clear: 1. It was in the majority's plan to use the highly meritorious service which Professor Kolmodin had otherwise rendered the society for sugar-coating his teaching, which for many persons was less delectable. 2. The time allowed to speakers on the question of the vote of confidence was, of course, to be so greatly limited that none of his opponents would have a chance fully to state his reasons against the motion. A way had, therefore, to be found how to overcome these two difficulties. It was easily found and followed.

### 27. AN EXCITING SESSION.

Several times as many delegates as during the last preceding years had gathered for the convention. There were present 114 representatives of provinces, or districts, and 136 delegates from congregations affiliated with *Stiftelsen*. General Friherr A. E. Rappe was chosen chairman. With a few words he bade the convention welcome, whereupon some time was devoted to joint prayer. Then the Report of the Committee of Revisers was read. Now, it was an old custom that there was no long debate preceding the resolution to discharge the old officers, but this time the custom was changed. For now the opposition took a hand in the running of affairs and thereby secured at least for its first speakers the right to speak without a time-limit.

The debate which now began upset the calculations of many, for now the main battle was fought, and the opposition had secured the tactical advantage which belongs to the party taking the offensive. The conflict was long drawn out, and for four hours the waves rose high. Outside the day was a day of high temperature, and it was hot, too, in Bethlehem Church, where the discussion took place; sometimes it seemed as if the convention were losing its head completely. If one overlooks the fact that this was a meeting of Christian confessors, one can readily enough understand on psychological grounds the stamping, hissing, cries, threats, and other things which occurred. Professor Kolmodin's followers had been certain of victory at the preparatory meeting, and now they saw all of a sudden that there was quite a possibility of the old believers winning in the voting.

At the preliminary meeting fierce contrasts had developed on either side, but now it was different. Those who disapproved Kol-

modin's Bible criticism were exceedingly moderate in their remarks. Their desire was that the directors should receive a full and grateful discharge; however, regret should be expressed that Professor Kolmodin's book, *Christianity and the Bible of the Primitive Christian Congregation*, had been disseminated by *Stiftelsen's* publishing house. Naturally it was quite difficult for the professor's followers to find a reason strong enough to justify their declining the above wish, all the more because it could be foreseen that such declination would bring with it a split in *Stiftelsen*. Accordingly, they offered no reason whatever. Those who tried to do so only did harm to the professor's cause, for the only reason they could give was that Professor Kolmodin would feel hurt and be compelled to withdraw from *Stiftelsen*. Of those sharing Kolmodin's view the greatest success of the day was without doubt scored by Pastor Valds Bengtsson, who would have swept quite a number of delegates with him when in a pathetic manner he appealed to the members of the convention in behalf of Professor Kolmodin, who for nearly a man's age, he said, had sacrificed his time and strength in the service of *Stiftelsen*. "True, this was merely a variation of the sentimental reason aforementioned, but the dish was served in an attractive manner."

If a vote had been taken immediately after Pastor Bengtsson's argument, it is likely that he and those sharing his views would have triumphed by polling quite a large majority; but the older and more considerate elements in Kolmodin's phalanx did not dare to steam-roller their opponents completely. Accordingly, a compromise motion was offered from their side by Rector J. Kerfstedt, which seemed to attract quite a number of supporters. This motion did not make any express mention of Professor Kolmodin's book, but confined itself to expressions of regret about the unrest that had arisen, and the causes that had led to it.

Here was plainly a point at which a union of sentiments could take place, and the convention was awaiting with intense interest what the representatives of the two factions would say. The first reply to the motion came from Professor Kolmodin, who informed the convention through Pastor J. Lundgren that, if Rector Kerfstedt's motion included any regret over the publication of the professor's book, he, Kolmodin, could not accept the motion, but must regard it as an invitation to him to resign. Immediately after this communication Editor Svensson, in order that he and those siding with him might preserve unity and peace as far as possible, endorsed Kerfstedt's motion, and when the mover upon



Professor Kolmodin's request had withdrawn it, offered it as his own motion.

During the debate Professor Kolmodin's sanctified personality, great humility, and extraordinary ability had been offered again and again as a reason why the convention should confidently endorse his standpoint. This talk about the professor's humility and godliness, which was repeated again and again, was not opposed from any quarter. On the contrary, one of the delegates who was a believer in the Bible, the preacher J. Wittander, stated that he and those siding with him were confident that, after beholding the effects of his book and seeing that the mission-friends, who formerly had been one, were by his action split into two parts, Professor Kolmodin would now regret that he had published the book which had caused so many sorrows and tears. An answer to this admonition was made, after the vote had been taken, by Professor Kolmodin himself, who explained why he had not supported Rector Kerfstedt's motion, and stated that, if he had done so, this might have been interpreted as an expression of regret over the publication of his book, and "that," said the professor in a sharp voice, "I do not regret; I do not take a single word back."

The result of the vote was that those siding with the professor scored a victory. 133 votes had been cast for, and 113 against, discharging the directors unconditionally from blame. When the result of the voting was announced, there followed for a while an indescribable tumult. Pastor B. Wadstroem stated that he now withdrew from the directorate of E. F. S. "It is over with *Fosterlands-Stiftelsen*," he said. Professor Kolmodin spoke and was given an ovation by the victorious majority, while the defeated minority stood silent. But when the older men tried to get the floor to speak, the majority began to hiss and stamp and crowded threateningly in front of the chairman's desk. Some one now started singing "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God." After the singing was finished, a great number of the minority men left the hall, where the election of directors now took place.

## 28. THE PROTEST OF THE MINORITY.

During the interval which now followed some of the leading men of the minority gathered around a member of the directorate of E. F. S., the wholesale merchant John Eriksson, and there was now drawn up by Pastor D. A. Aernstroem a protest ("reservation") against the resolution of the convention. Since this protest is directed against a resolution which the directors, in spite of

repeated suggestions, would not rescind, but stubbornly maintained, it may here be recorded in full. It reads as follows:—

“The undersigned, delegates at the convention of E. F. S. at Bethlehem Church, herewith submit their written protest against the resolution for exonerating the directors. Both parties had for more than four hours engaged in mutual deliberation, with the desirable end in view of preventing a threatening split by finding a resolution so worded as to unite the great majority of the members. When such unity had been achieved by Rector J. Kerfstedt’s motion, the entire matter was shifted from an objective to a personal view-point by the declaration of Professor Kolmodin that he could not support the resolution. Inasmuch as the resolution which was finally passed by a small majority seems to us to involve the abandonment by E. F. S. of its ancient and good standpoint on the infallible basis of the Bible and its departure upon the shifting sand of adventurous and uncertain Bible criticism, we herewith submit our earnest protest,” etc.

#### 29. THE VOTE OF CONFIDENCE.

In the afternoon of the same day the convention returned to its business. The point to be decided now was to what extent the conference would pass a formal vote of confidence in Professor Kolmodin’s fundamental position on the Bible. After the vote during the forenoon, which, in the last analysis, was concerning the same matter, the outcome was not difficult to foresee. The minority did not engage in any debate whatsoever. Teacher K. Loejdahl was really the only one who now took up the question for an objective discussion. He showed that Professor Kolmodin’s fundamental standpoint on the Bible was different from that of Luther and Rosenius. Now, inasmuch as Professor Kolmodin, notwithstanding this difference, would express no regret and take nothing back, the speaker stated for his part that the desired vote of confidence should be denied. When a young pastor, one of Professor Kolmodin’s pupils, tried to explain the professor’s fundamental position, he was silenced by his own party. There was an evident fear, which was also expressed, to allow the common people a correct insight into the scope of the mooted question. Wholesale merchant Lambert Jepsson predicted that hereafter many would lose interest in *Stiftelsen*. It had pained him most to find Pastor J. Lindgren holding entirely the same position as Professor Kolmodin. Moreover, many of the missionaries present had warmly expressed themselves as favoring the professor’s views. This



speaker's statement received very great strengthening by Pastor J. Montelius, who informed conference that most of the missionaries had in a letter declared themselves in favor of Professor Kolmodin's remaining at his post. Pastor Montelius, who during the debate in the forenoon had observed a cautious silence, now assumed for a while the leadership of the majority and desired that a vote be taken, in order to ascertain the number of those in favor of the vote of confidence. Since many of the members of the minority had already left the city, it naturally was in the interest of the minority that a vote be prevented which might yield a greatly misleading result. Once more Pastor Montelius wanted to force a vote, but he did not succeed. So much, however, was made clear, that the majority favored the professor's position.

After this Professor Kolmodin spoke. He expressed his joy over the fact that *Stiftelsen* had not written a page in its history similar to that which was written in 1869, when Professor Rudin was forced to resign. He said nothing — and perhaps there was nothing that he could say — about E. F. S.'s having written a very ominous page in its annals. They had done what no society before them had dared to do: by a formal resolution they had aimed to retain a man, and in order to satisfy a man's wish, had surrendered the first of the fundamental principles of the Reformation, the authority of the Bible to pass judgment on all doctrines. This had happened in Bethlehem Church. This fatal resolution *Stiftelsen* had been unwilling to rescind. The directors and conferences of *Stiftelsen* had again and again been admonished to rescind the aforesaid resolution, but no! it was not to be. But instead men had sought to persuade themselves and others that all was good and well. They had succeeded in inducing such confidence in many, but impartial historical research would not permit itself to be misled: it would render its judgment not only on words that were spoken, but principally on the actions that were taken.

### 30. THE MEETING OF THE MINORITY AT KUNGSHOLMEN.

On the day after the conference the minority gathered for a meeting in the mission-chapel at Kungsholmen to deliberate on their further course of action. Those who took part in this meeting will long remember the lovely peace and brotherly concord which characterized the transactions of this meeting. Pastor D. A. Aernstroem was chosen chairman, and Pastor Vitalis Svensson secretary. The latter had been a champion of the delegates believing in the Bible at the conference. The deliberations were concerning meas-

ures that ought now to be taken. Voices were raised that insisted on immediate separation from *Stiftelsen*, but they did not find acceptance. The meeting agreed to adopt a suggestion in writing to the directors of *Stiftelsen*, which had been drawn up by Editor Axel B. Svensson. In this document the following requests were presented: "1. The directors are to see to it that no writings favoring Bible criticism are issued by the publication concern of E. F. S. 2. The instruction imparted at the institute at Johannelund is to be carefully supervised. 3. The directors are to induce Pastor B. Wadstroem to retract his withdrawal and, besides, an additional member is to be called into the directorate, who is to be a person in whom the minority places full confidence." As candidates for this position Pastor Vitalis Svensson, wholesale merchant Lambert Jepsson, and Director G. L. Lagergrehn were named. In the expectation that the directors would meet these wishes, the meeting declared that it would not take any further steps immediately, but resolved for a year to maintain an attitude of expectancy. However, a committee was appointed, which, amongst other things, was instructed to arrange the preliminaries for a meeting to be held in connection with the conference of *Stiftelsen* in 1910.

Just as surely as there had been some in favor of taking too headstrong a course by having the minority separate from *Stiftelsen*, so surely were the measures that were passed insufficient. It should have been the concern of the leading men to *gather* the minority. "At the meeting in the mission-chapel at Kungsholmen there should have been formed a union within *Stiftelsen*. If this had been done, the situation would perhaps have become different. Now the minority was almost like a flock without a shepherd, and there was danger that each one would start out upon his own path, and imagine that to be the best and safest.

### 31. DISSATISFACTION IN THE RURAL DISTRICTS.

Not since the organization of E. F. S. had a conference been like the one described in the preceding chapters. It was natural that this conference, for which delegates had gathered from the entire country, should leave a mark.

In the outlying rural districts unrest had prevailed before the conference. When the delegates returned to their homes and made their reports about the meeting in Stockholm, the state of unrest, of course, was not improved. For more than a lifetime men had been accustomed to look up to *Stiftelsen* as to an authority well-nigh infallible. Now reports were being heard that this same



*Stiftelsen* had completely surrendered its faith in the Bible as being altogether the infallible Word of God. Men could not and would not believe any such thing. Moreover, many a sincere mission-friend held that, if the conference had expressed its confidence in Professor Kolmodin's basic position, that position must be correct, for people reasoned thus: "Old *Stiftelsen* cannot go astray." With this reflection many put their minds at rest and neglected to make a personal investigation of the state of affairs; they shunned the trouble of investigating, and they were afraid of the results of their investigation.

In the outlying rural districts many who were eating *Stiftelsen's* bread were traveling about and telling the people that all was good and well. They dropped hints that the fault of the division in *Stiftelsen* lay with the minority, and warned especially against *Nya Vaektaren*, while *Budbaeraren* (*The Messenger*) was recommended. In this paper the directors of *Stiftelsen* were represented as godly and humble men, while it was insinuated that the minority men were ambitious and carnal persons, who would quarrel for their own interest. In certain parts of the country this sowing bore rich fruit.

But not everywhere were these agents of peace successful in quelling the rising storm. Especially at Skaane and Vaermeland people had from the beginning of the controversy followed the arguments of the contesting parties and heard both sides. In many other places people had had their confidence seriously shaken. This became apparent, for instance, when the contributions for the mission-work of E. F. S. no longer were flowing as formerly. The fact that the only surviving charter member of *Stiftelsen*, Pastor B. Wadstroem, had quit *Stiftelsen* with the words: "It is over with *Fosterlands-Stiftelsen*," had without doubt contributed to this state of affairs. Moreover, he now published a book in which he not only laid bare the intrigues and duplicity which had preceded the publication of the Kolmodin book, but also urged the continuation of an energetic fight against the "Kolmodin leaven."

### 32. PROFESSOR ROSENBERG'S EXPLANATION.

There was another matter that rendered it difficult for the directors to make it appear as if nothing remarkable had happened: the followers of Bible criticism felt themselves called upon to blow the trumpets over their victory. But for all who had followed events it was clear that *Nya Vaektaren*, *Facklan*, Alfred Andersson,

and others had defended the authority of the Bible. Now, if the majority at the conference had defeated the defenders of the Bible, the majority was plainly on the side of Bible criticism; consequently, those must be right who claimed that *Stiftelsen* had abandoned its old position.

Among those who at a later time confirmed this fact publicly was Professor Kolmodin himself, who showed in an article in *Stockholms Dagblad* that the conference of *Stiftelsen* had expressed its confidence in, and accorded the right of existence within E. F. S. to, another doctrine concerning the inspiration of the Bible than the one which had previously been cherished by the majority of its members.

To some of the members of the directorate it was now evident that something must be done. Accordingly, Prof. J. O. Rosenberg, the chairman of the Board of Revisers, prepared an explanation which aimed at straightening out the trouble. In this explanation, which is found in B. Wadstroem's book *Some Leaves from the History of E. F. S.*, Professor Rosenberg, in the first place, lays down with many and strong proofs the fact that *Stiftelsen* of old had taught that the entire Bible, from beginning to end, is the infallible Word of God. Next he seeks to show that the conference expressed its confidence only in the person of Professor Kolmodin as a member of the directorate and as its Director of Missions, and not for his fundamental position. However, by this statement Professor Rosenberg made himself guilty of a significant attempt to disregard facts: Professor Kolmodin had never asked for a vote of confidence in himself personally, but for his fundamental position on the Bible. And *conference voted the resolution of confidence which Professor Kolmodin had desired.*

Professor Rosenberg laid the explanation which he had prepared on the directors' table, expecting, of course, that the directors must make a statement of the same import as his own explanation. But now he had the majority of the directors against himself. The only thing that was accomplished by Professor Rosenberg's explanation was that it furnished the Kolmodin phalanx in the directorate the opportunity for scoring another victory, and that the fact was confirmed still more that *Stiftelsen* endorsed Professor Kolmodin's fundamental position on the Bible.

(To be continued.)

---



## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

---

**Episcopalians Oppose Attempts to Suppress Church-Schools.** — At its convention in Portland, Oreg., the Episcopalians took notice, on September 19, of the referendum that was submitted at the election, November 7, and that purposes to wipe out all the private and parochial schools by making public school education compulsory. This referendum was attacked in a resolution adopted by the House of Deputies. The text of the resolution is: —

“WHEREAS, There has been introduced into the Congress of the United States a bill to regulate further the public school system of the nation; and

“WHEREAS, Legislation has also been attempted in different parts of the country which, if successful, will have the effect of eliminating all schools under the direction of the Church and all other private schools giving education through the elementary grades; and

“WHEREAS, We desire to express our approval of the public school system of our country and our sympathy with all well-considered efforts to develop and improve the public schools; and

“WHEREAS, We also believe that the English language should be the sole medium of instruction in all our public schools; therefore be it

“Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That the general convention express its abiding conviction that instruction in religion is an essential element in all true education, and that church-schools have an indispensable part in our educational system; and be it further

“Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That this general convention go on record as deprecating and opposing any and all movements seeking to secure legislation having as its natural result the injury and possibly the destruction of the church-schools of our land.”

What further action the convention has taken on this resolution has not been made public as yet.

The School Monopoly Bill (No. 315) was carried by approximately 10,000 votes at the election on November 7. This means that parochial schools in Oregon will have to fight for their existence in the State and, if feasible, in the Federal courts. D.

**What a One-half Vote Did at the Episcopal General Convention.** — The Protestant Episcopal Church held its triennial general convention in Portland, Oreg., September 9—23. From a report in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* we take the following: “The Protestant Episcopal Church has two houses, one composed of bishops and one of delegates called deputies, equally divided between clergy and laity. When there is a demand by any delegation representing a diocese, the vote must be taken by orders, the clergy and laity voting separately. Every resolution to be adopted must be carried by both houses, the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies, and if the

question involves the constitution or prayer-book, it must pass both houses at two successive general conventions. The subject of uniting with the Federal Council of Churches was first vigorously discussed in the House of Bishops, where it was carried by a majority of fifty-seven to thirty-one. In the House of Deputies it was the Chicago delegation which called for a vote by orders. The clergy vote showed a majority of five dioceses in favor of uniting with the Federal Council. The lay vote, however, stood twenty-five and one half in favor and twenty-five against. This would seem to the outsider to be a majority in favor, but the law of the Church does not allow a half vote to be counted. The half votes, we may explain, are given by missionary districts. If there had been two half votes, the half votes would have counted as one vote. The result was that twenty-six dioceses out of fifty were necessary to a majority, and the entire proposition, notwithstanding the majority of the bishops and clergy, was lost by a one-half vote." This one-half vote shows not only the doctrinal drift in the Episcopal Church, but also how far the Church has already gone on the way of indifferentism. FRITZ.

**Episcopalian Concordat with Congregationalists Adopted.** — After a discussion for five years and the passing by both houses at two general conventions, the Episcopal Church at its convention at Portland adopted a *concordat* with Congregational churches. The Episcopal bishops are now authorized to ordain any Congregational minister who applies with the consent of the church of which he is pastor, and allow him to remain a Congregational pastor. FRITZ.

**Making the World Safe for Rome.** — Says Dr. Foakes-Jackson in the *Churchman* (September 2): "Shorn of the trappings of power, the Pope and his *entourage* now enjoy the reality. They may be voluntarily imprisoned in the Vatican; but they have not to wander as homeless exiles in Italy and France. They may have lost their principality; but they have gained the power of administering their ecclesiastical affairs in security. They cannot lay down the law to the inhabitants of Leghorn or Perugia; but they can claim some influence in the government of New York and Boston. To an outsider the Church seems to be administered with all the skill the experience of eighteen centuries can supply, in contrast with the clumsy organization of modern governments. The bishops report and are reported on to Rome; nothing can be done without its being known to the central government. All vagaries of opinion are ruthlessly silenced, education is controlled with vigilant care. Modernism has been rendered impossible. Rebellion is almost unknown. Warned by the fate of the Old Catholics of 1870, no one has formed another schism. Rome really gains by her policy of antagonism to modern views. She will now have no subjects who are not submissive. They can leave her if they choose; but if they stay, they must obey. It is the fashion to believe that Roman Catholics are diminishing in numbers. This may be, but if so, they are increasing in efficiency. The strange thing is that the papacy is weakest where once she was supreme. She has lost Portugal and the French government, but not France; her hold is weakening in Italy, Austria, Poland, Spain, but this is more than



compensated by gains in the British Empire and the United States, of whose liberal policies the greatest advantage has been taken. In French Canada the Church is almost omnipotent; and we know its power in the cities of this country. In England the religious orders, which no nominally Catholic country will tolerate, find a welcome resting-place. The wealth of the Church in the United States is immense and is increasing rapidly under the *aegis* of the law, which penalizes an individual for holding land till its value increases, and gives unlimited freedom to a religious corporation to keep an estate from developing till it reaches the highest price." GRAEBNER.

**The Shakers.** — Quoting from the *Ohio State Journal*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (October 7) reports the following: "Recently the property of the Shaker settlement at South Union, Ky., was sold at auction. The sale marked another step in the dwindling of the longest-lived, the most interesting, and, in many ways, the most successful communistic enterprise the United States has ever seen. For more than half a century the organization has been growing smaller and weaker. Settlement after settlement has been closed and sold out, no recruits having come to carry on the work. Only a few small places remain. . . . The Shaker organization had its origin in England in 1747, Ann Lee being one of the early characters in it. In 1774, with seven others, she came to America. The first Shaker settlement was established at Neuskenna, now Watervliet, N. Y. It was put on a communistic basis in 1787, after her death, but retained her teaching of celibacy. The movement grew rapidly, and new settlements were made. . . . In 1870 there were 18 settlements with large churches, distributed through Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Kentucky, Maine, New Hampshire, and Ohio. In 1887 the membership had dwindled very much, and in 1902 was less than 1,000. The full name of their organization was the United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Appearing. They believed Christ would come in the form of a woman. . . . The fraternity, unique and interesting, has but a handful of members, very aged and infirm, strong in the faith, waiting the end, whose passing will close the interesting record."

D.

**Safeguarding against Temptation.** — In our issue of last week we spoke of the offer of \$1,000,000 reported to have been made by certain American moving-picture interests for the privilege of filming the Passion Play of Oberammergau for reproduction in this country, and of the possibility that, on account of the financial conditions prevailing and the munificence of the proposition, it might be accepted, although all similar offers had been turned down. Now comes a story which illustrates the conscientiousness and strength of conviction of those Bavarian peasants with regard to the matter. It is reported that as soon as the Passion Play season was over, the chief characters went to the barbers and had their beards shaved off, thus making the filming of the play practically impossible, since one of the cardinal principles is that no "make-ups" or adventitious aids shall be allowed in it. These wise peasants have therefore put it out of their power to consent to the commercializing of what is to them a religious service, and

incidentally have saved themselves from the pestering force of a temptation that might eventually have become too strong to be resisted. The scrape of the barber's razor on those erstwhile bearded faces was their practical and very effective way of saying, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" When Abraham was on his way to Mount Moriah for the sacrifice of his son, the thought must have occurred to him that his servants, if they were at the scene of the sacrifice, would undoubtedly interpose to save their young master's life, and that thus he, through no fault of his own, would be unable to carry out what he supposed to be the will of Jehovah. Therefore he determined that they should not be there, and halted them when the mountain came in sight, and he and Isaac went forward alone. That is, he hindered what might have been hindrances to him in his appointed task. It occurs to us that in the action of these men of Oberammergau we have a fine illustration of the spirit that was in Abraham—a spirit that does not intend to yield to temptation, and that will take every available means to make it impossible to do so.—*Watchman-Examiner*.

**The Ku Klux Klan a Greater Evil than Those which It Tries to Correct.**—It has been said that the Ku Klux Klan was born and is actuated in its operations by the conviction that the morals of our country are corrupt; that sexual vice, bootlegging, and gambling flourish; and that Jews, negroes, Roman Catholics, and alien-born are a menace to American institutions, and that it is necessary therefore to counteract their pernicious influence. Who will deny that there is much truth in the assertions?

But why adopt such methods as does the Ku Klux Klan? According to the reports in the daily paper, a man introduced as a "duly ordained minister of the Gospel" spoke in a church of the so-called Christian denomination. He is reported to have said that the need for the Klan to-day is quite as urgent as was the need for the original Ku Klux Klan of reconstruction days, when "Klansmen took the law into their own hands." He is also reported to have said, among other things, that when the Klan is strong enough, it will help all the foreign-born back to the land whence they came. The speaker, according to the report in the daily paper, used a small American flag, which he carried in the inside pocket of his coat, with theatrical effect. He would draw it out from time to time, fall upon his knees, kiss it, and call upon God to be his witness that he, as a Klansman, was a "white, Gentile, Christian gentleman."

We surely desire to protect womanhood, be it in the South or in the North, but by law and not by mob rule. We do not wish to have aliens come to our country and abuse the privilege of American liberty, and we mean to deport or imprison those who will not be law-abiding citizens, but as Americans we do not mean to bar desirable citizens coming from foreign countries, nor stir up strife and class hatred among those who are here. We do mean to oppose law-breaking of any sort not by breaking the law, but by enforcing it. Honoring the American flag does not consist in kissing it and performing with it theatrically, but in upholding the American principles of liberty and justice and peace and good-fellowship.



If a supposed minister of the Gospel champions the Ku Klux Klan or any similar organization, the case assumes even a more serious aspect. The Church has the only means to make man a truly different man than he is by nature, to convert him unto his God, and to persuade him to live in accordance with God's will. Having this Gospel and preaching it, the Church is an inestimable blessing to any country. But what shall we say when a supposed churchman casts aside this Gospel and resorts to other means for the purpose of reforming the world? Christ says: "If the salt have lost his savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" Matt. 5, 13. Shame upon any so-called minister of the Gospel who abuses and perverts the high privilege of his calling!

It makes much better reading when in the *Congregationalist* we are told that the House of Deputies of the Episcopal Church, at its recent convention at Portland, Oreg., "unanimously condemned the Ku Klux Klan for mob violence and lawlessness, and for stirring up religious prejudice and racial antipathy." A very timely and well-written editorial appeared also in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* of October 18, 1922, on "The Ku Klux Klan and the Law." We quote the closing sentences: "That many of the members of this society believe themselves to be engaged in a righteous public service is not to be doubted. Torquemada so believed. But this nation is founded upon law, and order under law is as essential to its well-being as are air and sunlight. The forces that operate in darkness for the application of mob violence are violating the fundamental principles of American government. And they are violating the principles of liberty, which are the spirit within our national body. This is a land where every man who complies with the laws is free to come and go and do as he will. It is a land which recognizes no differences of race or religion under the law. Every citizen, whatever his color or his creed, is entitled to the protection of the law, and to every opportunity for self-advancement that citizenship gives him. When this ceases to be true, this ceases to be a free country, ceases to be America. The Ku Klux movement is not American; it is anti-American."

Fritz.

**France.** — Dr. Blake, of the Methodist Episcopal Church of France, has published a book in French under the title: *Les devoirs de l'Amerique envers l'Europe* (The Debt of America to Europe). The entire publication is a plea for the canceling of the debt which France owes to America. Among other things, the author believes that the death of 1,500,000 of her sons and of 700,000 more who were disabled in the war places on the credit side of the ledger for France a greater value than any amount of cold cash could balance. He holds that all the riches of America are not worth one of the lives which France sacrificed in the war. He concludes: "Every American who knows the facts and comprehends the sacrifices will agree with us when we say that the blush of honest shame ought to mantle the cheeks of every American if his country were ever to exact from France the redemption or the money lent her for continuing the war."

D.

**Alsace.** — The *Ev.-Luth. Friedensbote* of June 18 takes notice of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Missouri Synod and reprints the editorial notice which was taken of this event by the *Kirchenzeitung* of the Ohio Synod. — The French government has begun to act upon its policy of expelling undesirable persons from Alsace. The expulsions began on Friday morning, August 11, and affected 100 persons in the Department Haut-Rhin, 150 in the Department Bas-Rhin, and 250 in the Department Moselle. D.

**Austria.** — Prof. N. Schlogl, of the University of Vienna, and belonging to the order of the Cistercians, has published a new translation of the New Testament. The geniality of the translator appears in his translation of Matt. 12, 50, where he puts the word "cousin" in the place of brother and sister, in order to avoid attacking the Catholic dogma of the perpetual virginity of Mary. In Matt. 26, 26 he makes Matthew say: "After they had eaten, Jesus took the bread, and after He had given thanks, He transformed it and broke it." Behold, the Catholic dogma of the transubstantiation set up in the Gospel! In 1 Tim. 2, 1, the apostle's exhortation to prayer and supplication for all men is turned into an exhortation to say masses for all men. D.

**Y. M. C. A.** — From *Nya Vaektaren* (September) we learn that in the Scandinavian countries Dr. John R. Mott is regarded as the Y. M. C. A.'s foremost man in the world and an extraordinary light, and that he is much talked about. He took part in the World Congress which the societies composing the Y. M. C. A. recently held at Copenhagen, and was interviewed by the Danish newspaper *Politiken*. Amongst other things, the reporter asked Dr. Mott whether in America it was considered necessary to be a disciple of the Christian religion in order to become a member of the Y. M. C. A. He received the following answer, verbally rendered: "No; we attach no definite importance to the religious element when we receive somebody as a member. For us all are alike good. In our swimming-pools and on our football fields, Mohammedans, Catholics, and freethinkers are engaging in sport side by side. You may be shocked perhaps to hear that we even harbor freethinkers in our organization, but the moral principles and the human value contained in Christianity can also be of importance to, and may even be acknowledged by, a freethinker. Upon the whole, you will find a far-reaching liberalism in our way of managing the young people's movement in the United States." The question was asked of Dr. Mott whether he considered it possible to gather the present-day young people around exclusively religious problems. He answered: "No, nor is that our object. We take the young men and women as they are, and we try to show them gradually what importance and what value there is, even from a purely human point of view, in following moral precepts that have found their expression in religion. We proceed quietly, and in a scarcely noticeable degree try to preach for young people." The editor of *Nya Vaektaren* remarks that after reading this interview of the most prominent American connected with the Y. M. C. A., he could well understand how an old freethinker like the Swedish Minister of State, Branting,



on the occasion of a visit at the front during the late war, could declare the activity of the Y. M. C. A. among the American soldiers to be quite praiseworthy. As a matter of fact, that activity consisted for the most part in arranging theatricals for the soldiers. The editor also remarks that from the above interview the much-heralded mission of Mr. Mott to the students at the universities throughout the world can be better understood, to wit, that it can hardly be regarded as a religious mission. The editor quotes a conversation between two college boys at Stockholm. One of them had inquired about the religious features of the Y. M. C. A. His companion said to him: "No, if you are looking for anything religious, you need not go into the Y. M. C. A. for it." In Sweden the gentleman who, next to Dr. Mott, takes the highest place in the Y. M. C. A. movement is Dr. K. Fries, who is said to be one heart and soul with Dr. Mott. D.

**Proscribed Children's Songs.** — A report in the *Koelnische Zeitung*, weekly edition of September 27, basing its information on the *Thuringische Dorfzeitung*, says that a new book of songs has been prepared by a teachers' committee for use in the public schools of Thuringia. When the draft for this book was submitted to the Thuringian Minister of Education, who is a Socialist, for his approval, he struck from the collection all Christmas hymns in which the Christ-child is mentioned or the Bible-story of the Savior's birth is referred to ("Ihr Kinderlein, kommet," "Alle Jahre wieder," "Du lieber, heil'ger, frommer Christ," "Kommet, ihr Hirten," "Stille Nacht," "Am Weihnachtsbaum die Lichter brennen"). He also proscribed all hymns in which some Christian concept such as God, heaven, angels, etc., is found ("Aus dem Himmel ferne," "Es geht durch alle Lande ein Engel," "Hoert ihr die Englein singen?" "Lobt froh den Herrn," "Weisst du, wieviel Sternlein stehen," "Voeglein im hohen Baum," "Wenn die Kinder schlafen gehn," "Bald ist es wieder Nacht," "Wer hat die Blumen nur erdacht?" "Des Sonntags, wenn die Sonn' anbricht," "Wem Gott will rechte Gunst erweisen," and even the old rationalistic songs "Was frag' ich viel nach Geld und Gut," and "Ueb' immer Treu' und Redlichkeit"). Many Germans are indignant at this action of a public officer of the state who must enforce the principle of the separation of Church and State and treat religion as a private affair of the individual citizen. The Minister of Education may be an atheist, — most likely he is, — but those who criticize him on that ground may charge the new constitution of the German Republic with being atheistic. Germans who want religion must learn to understand that the state will not, cannot, — ought not furnish it like in the olden times. As a curiosity it may be noted that patriotic songs such as "Stimmt an mit hellem, hohem Klang," "Ich hab' mich ergeben," "Deutsches Herz, verzage nicht," "Der alte Barbarossa," "Deutschland, Deutschland ueber alles," and the soldiers' songs: "Ich hatt' einen Kameraden," "Schier dreissig Jahre," "Hinaus in die Ferne," and, last, but not least, the new German national hymn were also proscribed by the Minister. This last feature hurts many Germans much more keenly than the removal of Christian hymns and songs. D.

## BOOK REVIEW.

---

*Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.: —*

**Popular Commentary of the Bible.** New Testament. Vol. II: Romans to Revelation. *Paul E. Kretzmann, Ph. D., D. D.* 664 pages, 7×10½. \$4.50.

We are pleased to announce that Volume II of the *Popular Commentary* is now ready. This volume completes the New Testament, Romans to Revelation. The make-up of the volume is the same as that of the first: the text stands out in bold type, then follows the commentary on the text, and finally a summary is given. Also for this volume, as for the first one, the author has written a number of articles and excursus. We quote the titles: "Justification," "The Election of Grace," "The Christian's Conduct in Things Indifferent," "Church Discipline," "The State of Holy Wedlock," "Christian Giving," "The So-called 'Social Gospel,'" "The Difference between the Moral and the Ceremonial Law," "Obedience — Absolute and Relative," "Antichrist," "Slavery," "The Universal Priesthood of the Believers," "Christ's Descent into Hell," "Chiliasm."

The completion of these two volumes of the *Popular Commentary*, covering the whole New Testament, deserves more than passing notice. Not only our pastors and our teachers in the church-school are thereby given a desk-book of ready reference, and Sunday-school teachers a valuable help for a better understanding of the lessons taken from the New Testament, but the average Christian has been given a New Testament commentary which is reliable as to doctrine, can easily be read and understood, and is within the reach of his purse. In fact, it was the plea of the laity which persuaded our Publishing House to arrange for the publication of a popular Lutheran commentary in the English language. It will mean much to our Lutheran Church if its English-speaking members — and these are, of course, the young people and those of middle age — will not neglect to study the Scriptures. It is the attention which our Synod has given to doctrine which accounts for its conservatism, its growth, and its success in the past seventy-five years. The reason for the deplorable condition of the visible church in our country and throughout the world is that many have forsaken the Word of God and have accepted "another gospel." But it is with reference to this "other gospel" that Paul says: "As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Gal. 1, 9.

Our Publishing House announces that Volume I of the *Popular Commentary* had a large sale. All the owners of Volume I will, no doubt, immediately send for Volume II. Others have perhaps been waiting for the time when they could purchase both volumes. In any case, the *Popular Commentary* ought to be bought and studied by our people.

Dr. Kretzmann is working on the Old Testament and has his manuscript for the first volume ready. May God graciously continue to guide him and let him well finish the great task of writing a commentary on the whole Bible! May the Lord graciously keep us in His grace and in His Word and spread His truth for the salvation of many! May He let the *Popular Commentary* be a means toward this end!

\* FRITZ.



**Synodical Reports:** *Southern Wisconsin District.* 63 pages. 28 cts. — *Northern Illinois District.* 68 pages. 30 cts. — *Colorado District.* 32 pages. 14 cts. — *Central District.* 68 pages. 30 cts.

The report of the Southern Wisconsin District contains a doctrinal essay by Pastor R. Schroth on "Christians Exercising the Functions of Their Priesthood"; that of the Northern Illinois District, an essay by Pastor H. Heise on "The Kingly Office of Christ"; that of the Colorado District, a very brief outline of Theses V and VI of an essay by Pastor Th. Hoyer on "The Saving Grace of God"; that of the Central District, an essay by Pastor Th. G. Frank on "The Threefold Office of Christ" and also an essay by Pastor F. J. Lankenau on "The Church and Missions." FRITZ.

**Ye Fathers.** Christian Home-Training. A fundamental requirement for improving the School Situation of Synod. *A. C. Stelhorn.* Single copies, 4 cts.; in quantities, 3 cts.

This pamphlet is published by the School Board of our Synod. It is a most excellent exposition of the duties of Christian parents to rear their children in the admonition of the Lord, and should be scattered broadcast in our congregations. MUELLER.

*Verlag des Schiftenvereins (E. Klaerner), Zwickau, Sachsen: —*

**Der Brief des Jakobus.** Ausgelegt von *Dr. C. M. Zorn.* 40 cts.

**"Deutsches Christentum" und "Deutsche Kirche."** Eine zeitgemaeße Warnung von *Dr. Otto Willkomm.* 4 cts.

**Zeugnisse fuer die Wahrheit der Bibel. — Welchen Zweck hat die Bibel? — Was ist die Bibel, und wie ist sie entstanden? — Enthaeft die Bibel Irrtueemer?** Each 4 cts.

*Verlag Schriftwort, Koenigsberg, Yorkstrasse 55: —*

**Was heisst eigentlich "lutherisch"? — Der lebendige Gott — Deutschlands einzige Rettung! — Jesus Christus — deine einzige Rettung!**

These excellent tracts, written by Dr. Willkomm and Rev. Huebener of the Saxon Free Church, as well as Dr. Zorn's lucid and practical explanation of the Epistle of St. James, serve the purpose of spreading the truth of God's Word, especially in Germany. Hence they are missionary tracts designed for the propagation of the Gospel, and as such set forth the teachings of Scripture in its whole truth and unadulterated purity. This blessed work demands our heartiest support, and it is for us Lutheran Christians, blessed so bountifully in temporal and spiritual matters, to promote it by our liberal contributions. The topics discussed are timely and of value also to our Christians. A most simple and effective way of supporting the missionary work in Germany by means of these tracts would be for Lutheran congregations in this country to order them in large quantities, and distribute them among those who still understand and appreciate the German language. The tracts and pamphlets have been gotten up with great care, and, while brief, set forth the respective Scripture doctrines with great lucidity and force. The tracts may be imported through Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. MUELLER.

*Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.:—*

**The Active Church-Member.** *R. C. H. Lenski.* \$1.25. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This manual was written principally for Christian laymen. Hence, in the nine chapters of this book the author treats in simple and popular style the main aspects of church-work, grouping them under the following headings: The Power, the Work, the Worker, the Spirit, the Organization, the Obligations, the Method, the Aids, and the Glory. The treatment of these subjects is succinct and clear, yet the author offers a store of information which the Christian church-worker ought to know. Occasionally the reviewer differed with the author. Thus it is claimed: "Because the pastor is the head of the congregation by virtue of his office, he ought to preside." (p. 93.) We beg to differ on this score. The very fact that also in the congregational meeting the pastor is the *teacher* of his flock ought to keep him out of the chair, in order that he may concentrate his efforts on the elucidation of difficult questions which are apt to arise at any time. Occasionally, too, there are statements lacking in clearness, as, for example: "When a man only thinks that he has the Word, he may be as confident as the old Jews who trusted in themselves that they were righteous. . . . Such confidence is like trusting in a shadow." (p. 83.) The proof-reader might have taken greater care to eliminate the large number of typographical errors which mar the book. Apart from these minor deficiencies, the book is good, both in content and in make-up, and we cheerfully recommend it to our pastors and laymen as a popular manual on questions that deserve greater study than is usually accorded them.

MUELLER.

*The Castle Press, Philadelphia:—*

**The Way.** A Little Book of Christian Truth. *Charles M. Jacobs.* 178 pages.

It is possible that already in the *Didache* the term *he hodos* was taken to mean "a system of religious teaching," a guiding compend pointing the way to the inquirer or novice for the possession of the entire truth. The author of this treatise points to the revised version of Acts 24, 14, as justifying his choice of a title for the same. In the easiest and simplest manner imaginable he offers the literary product of odd moments of his life—a statement of elementary Christian truth, the need of which, he believes, is felt by men and women "amid the questionings of an age that is not on the whole an age of faith." While the questionings which the author must have had in mind are not merely the tame and timid efforts of children and beginners to learn the truth about Christianity, but the violent and bold doubts of defiant opponents of Christianity, there is not a warlike note and nothing of the combative spirit of the controversialist in this book. Even its occasional rebukes, mostly in the field of ethics, are mild. The author's aim was to "put in some connected form of plain words the convictions that he holds about the things that are most worth while." In twelve chapters he discusses the Church of Jesus Christ, Human Nature, Jesus, God, Christ the Teacher of Righteousness, Christ the Savior, Faith, the Holy Ghost, Means of Grace, a Christian's Life, the Kingdom of God, the Christian Hope. Each of these subjects is developed in a manner peculiar to the author: from readily admitted facts he leads up gradually to his final positions. To note a few of the author's views, he is undecided



whether *ekklesia* in Matt. 18, 17 is the local congregation. (p. 8.) On the differences between the visible churches he says: "We do not all agree as yet; indeed, there are many very important things about which we entirely disagree. So long as this is true, it is better that we have our many churches, each standing for its own beliefs, than to have a single organization, filled with disagreement and contention. Our divisions are harmful only when they do not express real differences, or when they become the servants of intolerance and bigotries." (p. 14.) The last sentence weakens the preceding one: also where there are real differences, as between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches, or between Lutheranism and Romanism, the divisions certainly prove harmful and are, as a rule, characterized by intolerance and bigotry. No division among people professing to believe in Christ can be viewed or treated with anything like complacency. Christian truth is ever one, and it is exclusive; the Christian Scriptures, accordingly, are both *pros paideian* and *pros elegchon*. The view propounded on pp. 18—27 on the seemingly illimitable potential greatness and the bright side of human nature, on the one hand, and its unfathomable possibilities of evil, on the other hand, is rightly referred to the domain of common human experience, "without Christ," but even so it is an overstatement of the bright side. Even the *justitia civilis* and the use of reason in the affairs of this present life are tainted and ever retarded by sin, as the Lutheran Confessions point out. The Bible teaches not only that we were made in the image of God, but also that the divine image in us is lost. If the author's remarks on the possibilities of the human nature should be applied also to spiritual affairs, — and we are afraid that they will be so applied, — they are wrong according to John 15, 5; Eph. 2, 1. 5, etc. What the author has said about human nature should be read in connection with what he has said in the chapter on the Holy Ghost about regeneration, but even there the statement regarding the two adverse wills in the regenerated might be strengthened by a remark that the power which would raise us up is implanted in us by the Holy Ghost, is a new element in us, and therefore not in the same sense "a part of us" as the power that would drag us down. (p. 112.) On this latter point the author speaks correctly on p. 76 f. In the chapter on Christ the Savior, which exhibits the heart of Christianity, we find the substitution of Christ in the sinner's place and in consequence of this the reconciliation of the sinner world, taught. Of course, the very term "reconciliation" points to the wrath of God that made the atonement, propitiation, etc., necessary. A few words on this subject of the wrath of God and the vicarious satisfaction would be most timely at this place, in place of a popular error that is ever more spreading among men. So, too, we could wish not to have the State mentioned on a line with the family and the Church as the forces by which God brings His kingdom a little nearer to men (p. 161); for, as the author states p. 166, the State and the Church differ as regards their aims, means, and ends. D.

George H. Doran Company, New York: —

**The Preacher and His Sermon.** Rev. J. Paterson Smyth, B. D., LL. D., Litt. D., D. C. L., late Professor of Pastoral Theology, University of Dublin. 143 pages,  $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ . \$1.50.

This book contains five lectures on the following subjects: The Preacher; The Preacher: His First Five Years; Placere; The Quality

of "Grip"; Preparing the Sermon; Preaching the Sermon. Dr. Smyth quotes Archbishop Magee, who described three types of preachers: "There are some preachers whom you *cannot* listen to; there are some preachers whom you *can* listen to; there are some preachers whom you *must* listen to." Dr. Smyth adds: "I think there is a considerable number of the first, a very great number of the second, and extremely few of the third, extremely few; and I do not believe this need be so." The author makes a plea for more preachers of the third class, those whom people *must* listen to, and gives some valuable advice along these lines.

Some statements in Dr. Smyth's book we cannot approve. He says, for instance: "Especially should you try gradually and steadily to correct those old false views about the Bible and verbal inspiration which are the chief stronghold of skeptical attacks on Scripture. It is so easy for skeptics to point out to simple people in the Old Testament permitted usages that we would not tolerate to-day, and sentiments of inspired men which, we feel, could not win the approval of Christ." FRITZ.

*The Macmillan Company, New York:—*

**The Ministry as a Life Work.** *Rev. Robert Lee Webb, S. T. M.,* Corresponding Secretary, the Northern Baptist Education Society. 96 pages, 5¼×7¾. \$1.00.

This book makes a plea for more ministers. As reasons for the shortage of ministerial students at the theological schools of the various church denominations, the author, Dr. Webb, mentions low salaries and a lack of appreciation of the minister's work. Both of these reasons do not explain. Dr. Webb comes closer to the real reason when he says: "It should be noted also that lately the spiritual life of the churches of our land has not been of the type to emphasize the call to the ministry. . . . In the last analysis the solution of the problem lies in the spiritual atmosphere of the Church of God." But, after all, also in these words Dr. Webb's trumpet gives an uncertain sound, and "who shall then prepare himself for the battle?" The real reason for the shortage of theological students in other denominations (our own colleges are filled to overflowing) is the rank theology of those churches. When professors are tolerated in the chairs of theology who teach modern liberalism, denying the very doctrines plainly taught in the inspired Scriptures for the salvation of sinners, and when this same modern liberalism is preached in the pulpits of the churches, how, then, *can* young men be persuaded to study for the ministry; in fact, *why* should they be persuaded to do so? Modern theology is not filling the churches with people, and, of course, also not the seminaries of those churches with students. We agree with Dr. Webb when he says that the minister of the Gospel should be physically fit, mentally fit, and spiritually fit. The last needs to be specially emphasized and rightly understood. We also agree with Dr. Webb when he insists that the minister should be well trained for his work. He says: "Greek and Hebrew may not be necessary from our modern viewpoint, but it does seem fitting that the man who is to deliver the message of the Gospel should have at least a working knowledge of the wonderful language in which that Gospel was given to the world. The man unacquainted with Greek is shut out from the beauties and spiritual suggestions conveyed only through that matchless language. Such a man can



never be an independent investigator of the truth, for he must ever be subservient to the judgment and scholarship of other men. Moreover, the minister needs the intellectual training that comes from stiff courses of study, especially in the realm of language. He needs an education that will give a certain hardness to his intellectual and moral fiber; a power to face hard questions, to think them through to satisfying conclusions both for himself and the cultured men and women of his congregation. Other professions are steadily increasing their educational demands upon their members, and the ministry cannot afford to fall behind in the character and equipment of its members. Remembering the exacting conditions of our times, the many problems that demand wide observation, breadth of knowledge and culture, and clear, accurate thinking; remembering the increase of general education whereby college-bred men and women are found in every congregation; remembering the glorious greatness of the Gospel-message, we can hardly overemphasize the need of adequate preparation for the men who are to become 'stewards of the mysteries of God.'"

Finally, Dr. Webb says: "The only corrective for the chaos, restlessness, and laxity of the present is more religion." Yes, but of the right kind, namely, that of the Holy Scripture, "which is able to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." FRITZ.

**What Christianity Means to Me.** A spiritual autobiography. *Lyman Abbott.* \$1.75.

The Christianity advocated in this volume is not the Christianity of Paul, but rather the reconstructed and recast paganism of present-day rationalists. What this reconstructed Christianity means to a Modernist Lyman Abbott has endeavored to show in his "Spiritual Autobiography." To men like Abbott, "the foundation of the Christian Church is not Peter's doctrine of Christ, but Peter as a type of humanity transformed by the inspiration which he had received from a year of intimate companionship with Jesus." (p. 35.) "Hence the Christian Brotherhood, which is more than the Church or all the churches combined, is founded not on agreement in opinion, that is, on a creed; not on agreement in forms of worship, that is, on a ritual; not on agreement in the form of organization, . . . but on love and loyalty to a living Messiah, forever incarnate in the hearts and lives of His disciples, in a more intimate companionship and with a far mightier influence than when He trod the earth with a few score of faithful friends whom He gathered about Him." (pp. 43. 44.) "Obedience to Christ's commands is the only condition which congregations must prescribe for membership in the Christian Brotherhood." (p. 51.) "The real Church of Christ being the age-long and world-wide Brotherhood, *service* is its main postulate, as Christ's work consisted in the service of suffering humanity." (pp. 42—60.) "This Christ spirit, seeking by a common effort to save society from the ignorance which imperils it, has created and maintains the public school; has established social systems; has inspired the better forms of socialism; has sent thousands of Christian teachers, doctors, and preachers to carry into foreign lands and into the poorer portions of our own land the message of Christ's sermon at Nazareth." (p. 62.) "He who, inspired by the divine life of love, service, and sacrifice, is carrying glad tidings to the poor, deliverance to the captive, sight to the blind,

and liberty to the bruised, is a follower of Christ." (p. 82.) "The message of the ancient prophets was, in the main, that God is a *human God*, whose presence is intimate, continuous, inescapable. Man cannot escape from God, because God dwells in man, and man cannot escape from himself." (p. 96.) "Jesus Christ is the supreme manifestation of that love of the spirit which we can share with Him and His Father, an immortal life which the decay of the instruments it uses does not and cannot destroy." (p. 118.) "The *Gospel* is not the good news that guilty men may be saved from punishment, but the good news that guilty men may be made virtuous. In one word, salvation is character." (p. 140.) "Justification by faith no longer means to me that Christ has suffered the penalties of my sins, and therefore, if I accept His sacrifice, God will treat me as if I were innocent, although I am guilty; it means that Jesus Christ offers Himself to me as my divine companion, and if I accept his companionship, I can be made virtuous although I have been guilty." (p. 140.) "Atonement no longer means to me that Christ has made a reparation to God for the wrong I have done, and therefore God is reconciled to me. It means that Christ has by His life and teaching interpreted God to me, and by His personal presence inspires in me the will to do my Father's will, and so has reconciled me to God." (p. 141.) "Regeneration does not mean to me a new faculty miraculously given to man by some magic formula, as baptism, or some supernatural experience for which man must wait. In every normal man is the capacity for goodness and truth, for love and service, for hope and joy. But this sleeping capacity is naught unless it is awakened into life. It is a seed, but a *lifeless seed until it is given life by a divine power above itself*." (p. 141.) "Incarnation means to me more than that the spirit of God dwelt unrecognized by the world centuries ago for a few years in Jesus of Nazareth. It also means to me that the same spirit still dwells in the world, carrying on now with the followers of Jesus the work of serving and saving men which the same spirit carried on with Jesus then. Incarnation to me is not merely a historical episode; it is an eternal fact." (pp. 141. 142.) "God is love. Where God is, love is. And love is everywhere, a universal presence, a mighty, though not resistless, power in human life." (p. 142.) On page 185, the author summarizes what Christianity means to him. He says: "Christianity means to me: A new spirit of love, service, and sacrifice in humanity; a new, ever-developing life in art, literature, music, philosophy, government, industry, worship. A relief from the heavy burden of remorse for past errors, blunders, and sins; an ever-growing aspiration for the future and an ever-increasing power toward achievement. Faith in ourselves and in our fellow-men; in our infinite possibilities because in our infinite inheritance; faith in our present possession of a deathless life of the spirit which we share with the Father of our spirits and our divinely appreciated leader." We have quoted so profusely from the volume before us because the statements of the author show how far the Christianity of Modernists has drifted away from the Christianity of Christ and the apostles. It is a monster, though appearing as an angel of light. It denies salvation and the Scriptural means of salvation. It is rank paganism camouflaged in Christian idiom.

MUELLER.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

### January.

	PAGE
Schopenhauer's Way of Salvation .....	1
Little Journeys in the Higher Anticriticism .....	9
The Theological Observer .....	18
Book Review .....	26

### February.

The "Angel of the Lord" in the Old Testament.....	33
Christian Simple-Mindedness of an Illustrious Father of Revolutionary Days .....	36
The Theological Observer .....	42
Book Review .....	62

### March.

Lenten Testimonies .....	65
The Theological Student and the Bible.....	76
The Theological Observer .....	79
Book Review .....	90

### April.

At the Milestone .....	97
Lenten Testimonies .....	102
The Theological Observer .....	109
Book Review .....	125

### May.

Waltheriana .....	129
The Theological Observer .....	141
Book Review .....	145

### June.

Sexual Ethics in Present-Day Germany .....	161
The Theological Observer .....	176
Book Review .....	183

### July.

Theodore Emanuel Schmauk — A Biography .....	193
The Educational Vision of the Founders of the Missouri Synod.....	200
The Theological Observer .....	204
Book Review .....	216

## August — September.

	PAGE
Luther's Return to Wittenberg in 1522 .....	225
Apostolic Comfort for the Despised Preacher .....	235
Confessionalism of the Missouri Synod .....	240
The Theological Observer .....	245
Book Review .....	270

## October.

A Bit of Recent Swedish Church History .....	289
The Theological Observer .....	302
Book Review .....	310

## November.

A Symposium on Religious Education .....	321
A Bit of Recent Swedish Church History .....	330
The Theological Observer .....	340
Book Review .....	345

## December.

The True Criterion of Orthodoxy .....	353
A Bit of Recent Swedish Church History .....	362
The Theological Observer .....	371
Book Review .....	378

---